M 1770

February 4, 1970

SAN FRANCISCO

GROUP III

MR. NYLAND: I think we can dispense with the formalities to tell you that I'm glad I'm here. It's going to be for very short duration, because we will only have a meeting of this kind only one. I have to go back again on Monday. So let's try to concentrate in a rather short time what perhaps may be important, and you probably have to help me to tell me what is important. Maybe we'll start with questions of a certain kind-if you know the kind. Probably there are some new people here. We've had meetings like this before, and several of you, of course, are familiar. The whole purpose of meeting, or to have a talk with a group of people, or a meeting which I call 'semi-open', it simply means that those who come and may be new come upon the recommendation of someone else, and it is not a

question of advertising for it because then there is no way of making a selection. It's not that I would like to select those who come. I think they themselves have to select for themselves if they actually are interested, and that it is not only curiosity.

I would like to say something about the question of the Land - several of you, of course, know that the Land exists - admission to the Land is by invitation only, so, if you're not invited, you can of course ask, but you run the risk that you cannot come. The purpose, quite naturally, is that the Land has also a very definite purpose, much different from a meeting, because there a group of people will want to come together to work together physically, and it is supposed that they know the reason why they want to do that. And that it is clear to them that they have to have a certain aim for themselves which they would like to work out together. It's quite different when you come to a meeting because I can even assume that you don't know very much about Gurdjieff, or the ideas of Objectivity, and that you honestly want to find out what it is, what the value is, and perhaps then that you consider it might have some value for you. A person comes to the Land when he already knows that Work has a value for him, and it is then a continuation in a little different direction that he then wants to see if in the presence of others and working together physically on certain kind of construction,

it doesn't matter what, that they are there, and that because of this kind of either proximity with each other or the intention or maybe even enthusiasm for what they want to do, that they find some kind of a response in themselves as a result of working with others. So I just want to say that so there is no misunderstanding about that. We have to be selective because I want definitely certain people to come to the Land and only those where it is of value to them.

Come and sit down; don't stand.

I have an idea that it's quite a conglomerate group. People from different sections, whatever their life may represent; perhaps coming here out of interest, perhaps having heard a little bit about Gurdjieff and now wanting to find out some more. Let me say in the beginning that Gurdjieff probably has two aspects, to say the least; one is a philosophy, a certain description of how man is and how he perhaps could learn how to live. That has, of course, as a background an assumption that man as he is now on Earth is far from complete and that there is also for him a certain task which he has to take on his shoulders in order to make himself complete. On what that particular assumption is based that doesn't matter, but you might say that is the theoretical explanation why one Works on one - self because that indicates quite logically that work has to be done. So that part, that section of the philosophy of Gurdjieff, anybody can understand. It is not difficult.

It's intriguing. It is related to different ways of thinking and philosophizing. It also may indicate certain ways of behavior of people in ordinary life. It attaches itself to ordinary life in order to make it clear for each person who is interested what really his particular case is, and that then - after being acquainted more and more with the ideas as such - that such a person comes to a conclusion for himself that perhaps certain things have to be done by him. If you want to call it a religion, it only means that there is a certain conduct of one's life in accordance with certain principles, and the principles may be colored, as one says sometimes, religiously more or less. But religion in this sense only means that there is an acceptance and a very logical plausability of that what one believes that there are of course in this Universe certain intellectual forces which belong together and have created certain conditions of which Earth happens to be just a little planet, and that there is in general an intellectual understanding of certain rules and laws which exist in the totality of the Universe. And that man as he is representing life on Earth is not the only person who has Life, but that Life as such is made up most likely of a variety of different kinds and forms, different kind of crystalizations, and that there is perhaps even a certain hierarchy indicating that there is Life of a certain kind which is further developed than we are. The assumption again is that a man as he is

on Earth is not developed sufficiently, that there is a potentiality in him that he could develop but that the conditions on Earth are very much against it, and that it is one of the laws, which at the present time happens to apply to the Earth, that that what we call Mother Nature is really not interested in the further development of a man. That one still has, you might say, the audacity to believe that a man can develop comes from himself. That is, the realization that if he can become honest with himself that he then knows that he is incomplete, it simply means that he feels that the part that has taken place so far and the part he has played only has given him a certain amount of information about himself which then at a certain period of his life has stopped furnishing him with more information and that a point is reached in which a man does not grow any further. Where that particular point is depends a little bit on the kind of a person but the assumption is - and quite logically if you wish to verify it, you will have to agree with it - that man comes in his development to a certain point of standstill, and that all from that point on what can happen is that he just rearranges and changes a little bit what he has, but he really doesn't get much further. If one says "further", you must have of course in mind something that is like an aim and that this particular aim expressed in a Gurdjieffian philosophy has to do with an aim for further Consciousness. So that if a state of Consciousness which exists for a man on Earth is described by Gurdjieff as a waking or sleeping Consciousness - half-awake, half-asleep - that the next step in development for a Man could be called self Consciousness, and

that that particular state can be followed by another form of Consciousness which is called cosmic. There is no particular reason to define such terms a little bit more until one becomes interested.

The other side of the Gurdjieffian philosophy is that that what is given as so-called 'data about oneself', or a description of the condition in which man is, or that what is needed for him to arrive at truthful and more absolute statements about what he is in reality, that that then has to be followed by a very definite wish to grow further and that the rules given for how to grow have to be followed. So if one stays only at the point, and stays there, of being interested in the philosophy as such and does not want ~~to do~~ anything to do with it, Gurdjieff has lived in vain for you. The whole idea is that this is a kind of a philosophy which can be applied in daily life and is not that difficult to understand. The difficulty is always inherent in changing a condition of unconsciousness into Consciousness, and that of course applies to any kind of a religion and even to any kind of a philosophy. But there are very few religions where it is spelled out in very simple words what has to be done. Although it is indicated here and there and those who have eyes they can read it, it does not mean that it is so simple in the application. I think that what Gurdjieff has tried to do is to tell exactly what are the rules in order to acquire a dexterity as a result of Work on oneself, which then, if continued application is used

and wished by a man he will be able to change. And then that change will be in the direction of growth. And the growing is defintely related to the more fulfillment of a man than he is on Earth, and again that that what he is on Earth must be followed by the possibility of growing further in the utilization of that what he is on Earth.

So I would like to make very clear that when you want to listen, it's quite all right, but don't take it as a philosophy because then there is nothing that Gurdjieff has to tell you. You can go to any kind of other philosophy and enjoy yourself, but not with Gurdjieff. It is a requirement that when you listen and you want to know, that you want to take on also an obligation for the application of that what you hear. And if you don't want to do that, then stop coming. Groups of this kind are adjusted to the idea that one wants to find out what is Work. And of course one has to have a certain amount of knowledge, so that what you want to apply, that you know what it is that you want to use; also that where you use it for, or what you use it for, and what you use in the process of Work on yourself - that if your body and your personality happening now to be on Earth is in a certain condition, that it is necessary to consider that an instrument which is useful for the application of such philosophical data which ultimately, I hope, can give more insight into the life of man as he should be, or perhaps not as strong as that, as he might become. Because I think that as far as mankind as a whole is concerned, and all of us are just simple human beings belonging to man-

kind on Earth, that it is defintely not meant for everybody. Because if the organic kingdom as represented by mankind as a whole, and leaving out of the organic kingdom animals and plants which although they are forms of life are not sufficiently developed even to be compared to a man, that a man has a certain task if he wants to understand himself, that he then can become more full grown. And that many people, although the possibility exists because they are human beings, will not have, because of circumstances, or, because of their own non-desires, that there will not be a chance for them even to develop. And that a great many people simply will die on Earth without ever thinking or wanting to think about a further possible development, or an evolution for mankind as a whole.

To what extent it is necessary to believe that it is for each human being to become a Conscious Entity, that I think we leave out, because that would relate to the possibilities of man having this life to live on Earth, that perhaps either in recurrance or in reincarnation he may have a chance to develop in later lives. I think for us it is really in, unimportant. It is quite certain that many people die without ever having heard of Gurdjieff. But as far as Gurdjieff is concerned, it is not linked up with Gurdjieff only. Gurdjieff only was a person who brought certain things to the foreground and definitely based it on a certain amount of esoteric knowledge which has existed as long as mankind has lived on the Earth. So there is nothing special about it, and Gurdjieff never made any

claim, no claim to originality, only a claim to putting certain things in proper perspective so that then a human being, not necessarily too much developed or intellectually capable, would be able to understand it in his own simplicity and then try as well as he could to apply that what is the considerations of his own philosophy in his own daily life. That there are many people who of course will not be interested in that, it's quite obvious. Many die, and it doesn't matter to them. From the standpoint, you might say, of esoteric knowledge, even, such people on Earth are only supporting cells for the maintenance of Life in the body in which they have been created, and that upon their death, they have done their duty in having been a conversion machine for the maintenance of Mother Nature and sometimes, one says, for the maintenance of the Moon, and also one hopes that they have helped to maintain the existence of Anulios, which is a little planet on the other side of the Moon. But whatever the reasons may be for that, the fact remains that many people will die in what we call 'unconscious states'. And that they sometimes are so unconscious that they even don't know that they die that way.

I also don't know why people become interested in this kind of Work. Perhaps it is because there is a motivation necessary, which is based on certain experiences in ordinary life, and that when one considers in ordinary life the possibility of going a little bit deeper than the surface, and then entering into certain essential qualities of oneself, that, then, the questions which are there cannot always be

solved by the ordinary forms of behavior, or the activities in which we are engaged in our daily life. At the same time, when one lives on Earth, one has of course certain qualities which have to be adapted to the conditions of Earth, and that the requirements of all man on Earth is to make the best of the conditions in which they happen to live. And that even such states of jealousy or comparing oneself with someone else are all in the nature of Mother Nature. It doesn't matter so much for some, but for others of course it matters a great deal. And a person who wishes to find out what it is, and what has to be done in accordance with the ideas of Gurdjieff will have to base it on a motivation for himself - that his interest is really that he either has questions or that the questions are defintely related to having to accept conditions in which he happened to live and he doesn't like them. I think each person interested in these kind of things for a wish for further development has to have a motivation for himself that he knows why he wants to do it, and that that is based on the realization for himself that perhaps he has tried and failed. Also for those who still believe that there are other ways, Gurdjieff has nothing to say as yet. It is far better that you continue with your interests the way they are and particularly when your interest is so definitely linked up with the conditions of Earth. Anyone who wants to use Gurdjieffian ideas in order to become a better man on Earth, he has to think twice. Because I don't think you need Gurdjieff in order to become a better man or a

kind man. I think you need the common sense for yourself in order to grow and adapt yourself to the conditions as they are, or as they have been presented to you, or the way you happen to take them.

When it comes to the question of development, it's entirely different, because why do I wish to develop? I can have in mind, of course, that if I develop, and even on Earth, that I then will be able to adapt myself better to ordinary conditions. But the motivation is a little different from that, because if I have just a motivation to get rid of that what I don't like, I miss the boat regarding the possibility of Objectivity. Let me explain that a little bit. A person who in his subjective living considers the condition in which he happens to live not useful, would like to change such conditions. And if he doesn't know any better, the conditions again will be as subjective as the original conditions. And he probably will try to change such conditions to suit himself, or perhaps he will try to change himself. If such a person is honest he must know that if he tries to change himself that it will end up in failure.

I say this is the result of honesty. It may also be the result of having tried and actually finding that out. But if you're still in a state where you believe that further development of your brain, as it is now, or a development of your feeling, or perhaps even the condition of emotions, that that will finally give you the answer to the riddle of life, then I think also that Gurdjieff cannot talk to you as yet. I am afraid you have to wait until you have found

out by going in any kind of a direction you wish, that you then will not come to a point where you really are aiming at until you settle for something which in my opinion is a little cheaper. It does not mean that I criticize different directions, because each person has to make that up for himself. But there is only one road towards freedom from this life, and that road is not subjective. If we can agree on that particular point, then it will be much easier to talk about Gurdjieff, but if you want to quarrel about that, or argue, then it is not the right time, because I don't argue about such things. You have a right to follow whatever you wish, and you have a right to find out what you believe in, and you have to know that whichever way and whatever direction you want to go into, that it has to have an application in your daily life; otherwise it doesn't amount to very much. Because if you think that a religion like that, or a philosophy like that, is only good when you sit in your little room all by yourself, or where you withdraw from the world, or that it only applies to a Sunday and not to weekdays, then of course it's nonsense. It becomes just a little bit of a pasttime for certain times that may be then enjoyable, and we're not interested in satisfying your brain, neither interested in satisfying your solar plexus, or perhaps even your heart. We become interested in a mode of living. We become interested in how to apply ideas of this kind in one's daily life, not when you are separated from daily life, but, you might say, when you're in the midst of it, very much like Vedanta philosophy would require that what is beyond all action in the midst of

activity, to find that what in the terminology there would give you rest or at least a balance.

In Gurdjieffian sense we talk about two kinds of ways of living. One belongs to living on Earth as a human being and as he has to behave. It doesn't matter in what particular country or in what particular kind of culture, whatever civilization has touched him or not - it may ~~even~~ apply even to a wild man in Australia, or an aborigine of some kind - it doesn't really matter at all. We talk about human beings as they are, and they have adapted themselves to the conditions in which they happen to live. This is a certain form which we simply call 'outer life'. It is very much on the surface, most of the time it is on the surface, and only every once in awhile it gets a little deeper, but usually it stops when it gets a little bit too deep because perhaps it is a little too difficult and sometimes one says it's a little bit too private. Your relation of course always has to be resolved in that what is one's inner Life, and that you can give different kind of names. You can start with your Conscience, which then would indicate the conduct of how you should live, and you can end up with the realization that God exists and that you in relation to that perhaps even could be considered a child of God. But whichever way you want to take it, the question of the solution of your outer life is not in outer life. Outer life will only give you adaptation to it, and you can satisfy yourself quite sufficiently by making the proper arrangements with yourself so that the adaptation process does not require very much more and a great deal of your ordinary behavior can be

relegated to habitual forms. It does not require too much thought and after some time the adjustment is also made in your mind. There are certain questions which after some time you cannot solve, you simply are satisfied with it because you said it's impossible for me to find a solution, so, and then, "let's live now because we don't know what will happen tomorrow, but it doesn't matter so much."

The difference between an outer life and an inner is not sharp. One goes from that what one calls the surface a little bit further and deeper within; one calls it a little bit more essential. Sometimes one calls it as if one goes from intellectual to an emotional state. Many times in living on the surface, one already wishes to introduce an emotional state. It can be introduced of course in any kind of an intellectual endeavor, but usually the emotional state is linked up with your heart, or, in ordinary terminology, with your solar plexus. And a person, then, who can feel and every once in awhile live in that and hopes that his feeling will be the guide to himself, of course he starts and perhaps he becomes an artist of some kind, or even he can become a religious man, and maybe even fanatic. As far as the scientist and the philosophers are concerned, probably a little bit more intellectually inclined, for them also such forms of life can be found.

But the difficulty is very much between an intellect and a feeling. And if a man just in a simple way considers his life and realizes that in the affairs of ordinary life which he has to meet, many times there is a conflict between that what he thinks and what he feels, which many times is not

soluable at all, that then he follows the line of least resistance, or which seems most likely, or that what he feels perhaps is in the right road, and takes a chance. What helps him of course is what might be called the affect of his body, and that many times, particularly when certain things already have become habitual, the mind is excluded and then it is an affair of the body and perhaps their feeling.

And the way we are as human beings, we're quite screwed up, because we really don't know what we want. We know something in the mind and the feeling may contradict it, and then the body comes in and has wishes of its own. And what will we do? I don't have reference to anything that has to do with ordinary life, where the adjustment is a little bit easier made ~~may~~, because you can become friends with your friends, and your enemies, of course, you can avoid. You can also run away from certain things that accidently happen to you, and that you don't like to solve; if the world is large enough, it's all right. You can even move from one place to another. And maybe certain questions that you cannot solve, you can leave alone, because perhaps the interest is quite sufficient to maintain your life. And as one grows older and you get a little bit more maturity and you know a little bit more about the other part of the world, and the people you have dealings with, you know how to adjust yourself more, almost I would say, quite easily. And whatever there is of principles in yourself it is not so easily touched, because the principles

are not primarily on the outside layer of yourself. They really don't appear in ordinary life. There are ordinary ethical values, or there are political ones, or perhaps even economic, and there are of course a little bit scientific and certain things about which one loves to talk, because the talking is cheap. The talking doesn't mean you have to do something. The talking is only a little enjoyment, in order to come to clarity or if it is possible to establish a word which is satisfying to you, and then you don't have to think any further. But when it is in contrast between that kind of an activity in which you then become engaged, and of course, which you like very much, or that you even become a very good man in a community, and that you follow certain pursuits in relation to helping the poor, or to donate to a hospital, or to feel sorry for those who are sick, all of that is very much superficial. When it hits home, that's a little different, when it is in your immediate neighborhood or when people die who are friends or perhaps even relatives of yours, but as far as people dying out in China, it is just a little rule, and a little notice in a newspaper and you read it, and you say "too bad, isn't it?" So many people starving of starvation, or not enough food, or perhaps in war, and it is really not touching you very much. And even if you try, and you can very easily set up something which is excluded from the rest of the world; you can have your own little community. You can be as you like within that. You can set up your own little rules. But you're not part of society as a

whole, particularly when you object to society and you want to withdraw, and then you pursue a little bit of an aim and it is a mutual admiration society, in many cases, where you only want to be friends with those who think alike. And those who are animostic, you shun them because they are not of your class or whatever terminology you want to use for that.

I'm talking about an average man who lives a certain life on Earth, who earns a living and has contact with different people, who has responsibilities already, partly laid on him because he happened to be born that way, partly coming from his family, his father and mother, and partly because when he grew up there was a period in which he said, "Now I'm on my own feet, so let's say I'll get married, I'll have a family, I want to have friends, I want to do this, I want to do that," all such things are of course responsibilities, and as he continues to live he has to discharge them, and if he doesn't he probably doesn't have much of a standing in society, but his conscience will allow him to lie about it or to rationalize or to find all kind of reasonings why he can do this and not the other, and all the rest that simply belongs to those who want to write books about it and study sociology. I'm not saying that it is not worthwhile; very much; it is even at times very beautiful, and I think it is good occupation for those who want to get along in this world. And of course one comes to certain rules; ethical, maybe, sometimes religious, sometimes dogmatic, sometimes in accordance with a doctrine only, sometimes with an inter-

pretation of a philosophy or you can find yourself in an ambition you might have in professions. You can become either scientists or whatever. You can teach even, you can be an upstanding man in your community and people can even admire you. All of that belongs to Earth, and it is quite right and let it be there. Because that's where it belongs.

We talk about something else. We talk about, when the Bible talks also and says, "Where is the kingdom of heaven?" What is meant by heaven on earth? What is meant when the Bible talks about sleep? What is meant by the development of a man? What is meant by not judging? When you take the Sermon on the Mount, it is filled with statements, and I don't know if you recognize Jesus as a man who had something to say. And whatever you now understand of that, there is at least a certain fund of wisdom in the New Testament, and I think when one is serious, one has to deal with it the same way as you would like to know something about Buddhism or about the other religions of the world. I think that even belongs to a so-called "cultured man" when he lives on Earth.

But what is it to me? That is, what can I do when I'm confronted with ordinary conditions of life and I have to make an adjustment, and in the first place I don't understand why I should make an adjustment, because in my Conscience I say I want to be truthful, and apparently it doesn't always work? I cannot always say the truth, because it will not be understood. Many times I have to behave in a

certain way for different reasons. I can not always talk about that what really concerns me, and in perfectly good faith, that I don't dare to talk about it because it might cause trouble, and trouble for me, and every once in awhile I don't want trouble.

When I live and I get older I make more and more adjustments. Gradually my interests also start to diminish. The adjustments are simply that I would like a little bit easier life, or that I believe in industrial development which makes a push button existence much more desireable for me. I want to run a car, but I don't want to become a mechanic. I may have definite directions in which I want to go, and of course I can call it either 'hobby', or if it happens to coincide with making a living, then it becomes a profession.

But the question is what is there at the present time teaching us to develop my inner Life? Religion? In accordance with what? What is taught in the church at the present time? What is so-called 'interpretation of the Bible', let's say Christianity? Or being Jewish? Or Roman Catholic? Acknowledgement of certain authorities? On what basis will I keep on thinking? And I say for me it cannot go, because I don't understand it. Still I have to follow a certain rule. There is very little freedom about that, if I want honestly to become a member of any kind of a Church, or any kind of a religion, and there are so many loopholes when I start to think, and when I want to interpret it in my own way. For instance I will never agree about the concept of God with someone else. It depends on the way I have been brought up,

and the way whatever I have experienced of a higher force, if I say totality of life, if I call it infinity, if I talk about absoluteness, what are such terms? Of course I can quote them, I can say, "Yes, God is omnipresent." But do I have any concept what it means? Not in the least. Although I can philosophize about it and I can talk and I can foam at the mouth in arguing, and of course I can disagree with everybody, but what is fundamental for me? It's my life as I have to live it day by day; it is the condition in which I find myself as a result of a telephone call which I don't like or a little, a little letter that I get flattering to me, and knowing well enough it is not true, but it satisfies me because it is so nice to be respected.

The times that I have a little Conscience and then if I try to live in accordance with it, I don't even know what to do because my Conscience is not sufficiently developed to tell me what to do. How can I live? How can I be nice to people? How can I follow even a command that all the rest of the world of humanity is my brother and sister, when I hate them, and I get angry, and I lose energy, and I'm upset, and I get ulcersin my stomach, or I'm sick because so and so told me this and that and then I can not Work for two or three days because my emotions are involved? What is it that I, when I become involved, I use my feelings and my emotions in order to produce certain things, and they become part of me, and I, supposing I exhibit them, or I tell people about it and someone makes a sneer remark, and I'm ready to kill him.

I'm talking about life as it is being lived by all of us without exception, maybe not sometimes so strong, but at the same time if there is life, you're liable to have some strength, and every once in awhile one gets hurt, and one does not know what to do with it. You can pray. You can try to find out. You can go to a minister and maybe he will tell you something, and maybe there are certain modes of life on Earth. What is the problem when it comes to inner Life? What is really meant by a development of a soul? What is meant by heaven even if we wish to bring it on Earth? What is the condition of Earth which prevents heaven to exist? What is it that I say in certain moments when I know it is as if it is out of this world and not of this world? Does that have any kind of a meaning for myself when I experience it?

Gurdjieff talks about such things. He talks about a Life of a man as he is essentially, and that his essential Life has to grow, has to develop in such a way that then when the accent is placed there, he can cope with the conditions of outer life. It is a changeover from a standpoint where I now live outside on the surface to that what becomes an inner conviction, and when I say this, 'where is the point of gravity of my life at the present time?', and I try to consider how have I spent my day, what have I done with the energy which has been given to me or is there as a result of being kept in good health? What is it that I have utilized and for what purpose? And have I, in regard to that, lived conscientiously? Now we're talking about principles; we're

talking about something that belongs to each one of us, and is more or less developed in everyone of us, some a little bit more and some a little bit less, and it has not to do with a relationship between people, not primarily. It is not a question of being a missionary and going to convert the heathens; it's a question of my family, it's a question of my personality; it's a question of my world where I live and where there is chaos in my own world. When there are thoughts that I cannot place and that I'm woozy and confused, that I have a feeling which does not agree with what I think I ought to think, and that the activities of my body sometimes they become so predominant that never mind what I think or feel, the body has to have its say, and many times I follow it because I don't know any better, and I don't know how to counteract it.

Now I hope we make a little sense. Because you see now the direction in which we talk - it is not at all philosophy anymore, and it is not even a desire for wanting to know what is meant by 'Work on oneself.' It is still the basis why there is a reason for Work. And it is also a description of what I work with when I consider myself the way I am that I ought to be much more truthful than I am now. And I would like to eliminate my rationalizations because they cover up the truth. They make it a little bit more pragmatic for me, because then I have a conduct that I can follow without too much trouble. I want to talk about troubles, about suffering, about real attempts of doing the right thing, and not being able to do it, partly because I don't know, and partly because I have not the

strength to do it. Can I be free as a human being from others? Am I affected by their opinion of me? Do I influence other people? How is my relationship with people, where I've sworn that I will be always truthful to them? What is it that I say, at times, I will allow my body to get a little drunk, when I know that perhaps even it's wrong, or that I do it and say, "Yes, it doesn't matter, a little bit," and before I know it, it's a little bit too much? When we live in the world of drugs and are affected - I talk about it every once in a-while, I don't want to talk about it now - but it is extremely important that you see what is happening. I talk about salacious literature, all kinds of superficial nonsense that's being printed, everything that is in the newspaper that you have to read or want to read or you spend the time on, the uselessness of many forms of energy which ~~are~~ are simply thrown in the gutter without any particular benefit to you, squandering of energy of your health, thinking that you can get along with it and perhaps that you can get away with it. Where is a Man, and what is a definition for a Man? A Man, of course, acts because his thoughts and his feelings prompt him. He acts also physically because his body tells him that certain things are needed, but in general I think a Man has a brain and a feeling for a definite purpose. It means that that has to be expressed in behavior forms of his personality. And it becomes very simple, that when I now am acting, that then that is a result most likely of what I have been thinking or feeling. Then the problem again, if there is agreement between the two, I can act. If there is no agreement, that what weighs

the heaviest of course wins out, and it may be the wrong thing.

Can I rely on my mind to tell you what is right, to tell my body what is right? Can I say at any time my mind knows the truth? That is the beginning of a verification process, because now it is a question of the different things we talk about, to what extent you feel that they apply in your own life. Not in the life of a person sitting next to you. It is a direct question, direct to you. And I would almost say you can't get away from that, because if you try that is a characteristic of evasion. It's also fear. It is also that you have no interest.

And let's put it very simple. What is each one of us as a human being? What is their standing? You understand when I use the word 'a level of being'? A Being as a man is that what he is in his own three-foldment. The three-foldment of a man is simply that he has a body, that he has a feeling and a mind. There is no particular reason to question that, because you can, of course, question many of such terms. You can say that the mind is already mixed with the feeling. You can say, even, that the feeling sometimes has a very definite instinctive value, sometimes you call it having a certain initiative, or a fore-feeling, that is, a knowledge which is based on one's feeling, sometimes intuition. You can also quibble about the fact that the feeling center is really not a center, but that it is dependent for its expression on the behavior of your physical body. You can also say that your physical body is mixed with your brain when you talk. And all such things, I feel, are quite useless. In a very general way a

man knows the difference between his physical body, he also knows when there is something going on in the region of his heart, or in his chest, or in his solar plexus, and he also knows what is meant by a thinking process in his brain. That there are different forms of knowledge that can reach him in different ways, that there are different rates of vibrations which are not limited to his feeling and sometimes take place in his mind, and sometimes his body also vibrates, all of that I grant you.

A man is threefold. We do it simply, we use that kind of a description for simplicity sake. The threefoldness of a man can be connected, the three of them together, to become a totality which we call a personality. It may be that there are still conflicts in the three centers. We call them centers. Gurdjieff calls them brains, because all of them have acquired certain data of knowledge; but whatever that is, I can be whole in ordinary life, or I can be more or less combined in the three centers - I will continue to call them that - or sometimes one or the other, or the third may be predominant. But the totality of that what they are, and as they make up my personality, indicates the level of my being.

The level of my being is of course a certain height; otherwise it wouldn't be a level. It can be close to the ground, it can be a little higher, it can even be in the clouds. For practical purposes, each person has a certain level where he lives. Also that is an average, because he may be at times high, at other times low. Maybe at times he is enthusiastic, and then his level is a little bit

more alive. Maybe he's morose, and then it is down. If he considers his feeling, it may be way up and way down and the balance is somewhere in between, or it may be even as contentment, not ruffled too much. In all the different types that one can describe, wither astrologically or psychologically, again, it doesn't matter. Each person has a certain average, which he calls 'where he lives'. And although he may be living in his mind sometimes, sometimes somewhere else, he represents to the outside world a certain human being with interests, with abilities, with an activity, with an aliveness. And that what is in a being is an expression of his life.

This particular level is, of course, at different distances away, you might say, from the surface or from the Earth. And sometimes you may even live in the clouds, but let's keep down to Earth as much as we can.

It is a question for oneself when one considers the height of the quality of one's level of being; there is another factor that enters into that also. We simply call it 'quantity'. The quantity of the life of a man as expressed in his being is that what is his density. Sometimes it is materiality, but it is definitely a form in which his life appears. And what really is important for such a man is that he has the ability to judge every once in a while where he lives, and also what there is to live with. If the level of one's being is important for a man, and if then he says, "I am bound to Earth and the level of my being is kept here,"

his desire for freedom from such bondage could be a motivation for himself to develop. Because I can very well imagine that a person in a certain process could become less and less dense, finally be so light that the law of gravity of Earth, either physically or psychologically, cannot keep him here, and that as a logical result, he would go up into space, and maybe, in his explanation, he might even go to heaven.

The development for a person as he lives now on Earth is also twofold: he lives on Earth for a definite purpose, and he has to meet the conditions of life on Earth as they are presented to him. He has to solve them; that's his task, because he happens to be born here. He was not born somewhere else, and he may fuss about it, and he cannot like it, and he wants to do this and that, at most you can say he can kill himself, but in any event as long as he wants to continue to breathe, he has to meet the conditions as they are, like it or not. This is of course I call 'adjustment to the conditions as I find them.'

The second purpose for a man is to be able to develop, and it is in that kind of a process that what is his earthly existence, mostly represented by his body, could be solved if his body, which now contains his Life, even if it has to die, that his Life could continue to exist. And that then the purpose is quite a different one. In the first place, that something could be built during the time that man is alive on Earth which then could become the living quarters for his Life, or that ultimately something could be built also by him, and through his own efforts, which in the Bible is called

a Soul, which is the continuation of a man's Life after his death. The fact that he has to build it simply indicates that it's not available, but it is a possibility for him to make it.

So here are the two accents, the points of gravity; one I link up with my behavior in the outside world; the other I start to link up with the potentialities of my inner Life. My inner Life could represent a much truer picture of what I am, because it's not affected so much by the outside world. It is not as yet Conscious or Conscientious. It still is there made up of all kind of subjective elements. But the different ways by which such subjectivity is expressed is of course much less the more essential I become. One can philosophize about it and say, at the point where there is no further return, which is the central point of my life, there of course I would find the truth, because, there, in that point, I don't need any further manifestations. I can also say that that what is my Life is at the present time within me, and I call it my body as a form. And if I can understand the separation between Life as such and the form, then I can also understand that if I want to find out what I really am, I must not consider my form only, but I have to consider what is this Life as represented by me. I can also say that that what is my Life is mine. But then I get into trouble with the concept of life, because if I believe that life is not death, I must believe that life is eternal. I cannot get around that, because if I limit life, there is death to it. Because then there is something else outside of life, which then starts to exist, and

if it has not the limitation which I place on myself, then of course that kind of life is worth much more. And I can reason about it, because I must come logically to the conclusion that Life must be eternal because death is death; it is not Life.

Without trying to prove it, I simply say I am alive, and I take that what I now represent as the way I behave as my life. It is just as difficult to try to find my Life, and separate it from my body, as it is to find my feeling and separate that from the manifestations of my body. It is the problem that one has to construct certain things out of pure elements. If I consider myself as a three centered being, I can also understand that that what I now call centers, that they are soiled. You might even say that each one of the centers has taken in each other's washing. They are not a household on their own. They are dependent on each other. There is many times a relationship between the mind and the body. There is without any question a relationship between the body and feeling. But my feeling and my mind are not on very good terms, and there is really no direct road, but there is also a conflict, so they know of each other. That they fight indicates that there is aliveness in both, and that each recognizes the aliveness of the other.

The problem for a man when he is as he is on Earth, without actually trying to prove why he is the way he is, is simply that he finds himself in any one center inter-

ferred with by any one of the others. That when my feeling is there, it becomes immediately expressed throughtthe physical body. That many times I want to find words for what I feel until I have to give up, knowing that it cannot be expressed. Whenever I have a mind and it starts to think, very soon it will be followed by an activity of my body. Sometimes I want my mind to express what I really feel, because I don't live all the time on the surface, and as soon as we become a little more essential, that what I call my voice, which is stimulated by the thought of my brain, becomes then in its flexibility a little bit more expressive. And there I have a case where my mouth must form a word as a result of a thought, and then I introduce into that something that belongs to my feeling.

In most cases, however, if I wish to connect for some reason or other the three centers into one, I cannot do it. I am dependent on accidental happenings. I cannot because there is nothing that commands anything subjective which is not subjective. You see, the search for a solution, if I consider myself totally a subjective creature, is that there must be something that could function like a king, or an outsider, or that what has a different kind of quality of authority. So it is not one of the subjective elements of myself talking to another subjective element, because they have no authority; both are subjective, and both are in their own eyes equally good. A solution cannot be found that way, and it doesn't matter if you want to de-

velop your subjectivity to the nth power, it will still remain subjective.

The idea of freedom has to do with something that sets subjectivity free, and because of that it has to have certain power which subjectivity does not have. To say it a little differently, it has to have a key to open the door to let subjectivity out, and the subjective person cannot open the door to himself. It's possible sometimes that someone else can do it who is not attached to me. As soon as they are attached they are forfeiting the power really to be objective towards me, but if something that I don't know, and a person outside of me not knowing anything about me can treat me in a very simple and perhaps even cold manner, and I say then can be objective, because he's not connected with me, and this gives me a solution to what actually should take place in a man if he wants to get free from his subjectivity.

There has to be some kind of an entity which starts to function in a certain way, I call it now 'impartial.' By that I mean non-subjective, and I call that, of course, 'objectivity' because it is a good word for it, but the Objectivity must start to function impartially towards me. And then I can have a judgement from such impartial observation, if I believe that that ~~is~~ what is then recorded, is truthful. The truth requires a little bit more than just an observation process, and also an Objectivity, which is expressed in impartiality, first.

You see what is my enemy is the constant thoughts coming in to explain, or to argue things away, or to rationalize, or the kind of conditioning that I'm used to, and in

general I call it 'the associative quality of my present mind'. This is what makes me really tremble a little bit when I start on the road to find out what is Objective of myself, so that if such Objectivity could exist, it then actually could have power over all of my subjectivity.

In order to eliminate associations, I have to have a mind which is free from that kind of a thing. I have to be a certain, I have to have a certain mind, I would say, which is free from memory. It also must be free from anticipation. And my mind, in a subjective way, keeps on thinking, and has to do only with that what is future and past. This is the unfortunate part of a brain of a human being, that there is no facility in the mind to represent the present moment, and as a matter of fact the mind cannot even conceive of a moment, because for the mind time flows through a person and for a moment it is attached and then the time of oneself becomes a part of one, but the moment is fleeting, and immediately time becomes past, and my mind has been trained to consider only that what is coming, and that what goes and never that what is.

The true definition of the level of a being is that at that point a man could be as what he is, without wishing, without being partial to that what he thinks. And that would be, of course, a certain level in which there would be freedom. But what it implies is that when I collect facts now about myself, they have to be free if they are impartial and they have to be observed, we call it 'simul-

taneously', we call it 'a moment' or 'an instant' at which that what takes place is recorded at that same moment.

It's a little philosophy and it's not so easy to understand it, but one can feel it, because it's quite obvious that freedom from myself never will exist as long as my mind keeps the bondage to myself. To become free from one's mind, to become free from one's feeling, to look even at one's body impartially, of course are difficult things.

The freedom from mind means that I could not pay attention to the thought process, because the thought is of course subjective. It is not possible to eliminate my thought, but I can reduce it and I can also have a certain section of my mind function in a different way.

The question of impartiality regarding my feeling is of course extremely difficult. It's very very difficult to be impartial to that what is completely partial, and what I call feeling of myself is of course the identification of myself as I happen to think about it, as I consider myself, or as I give a description of what I am.

And these are the difficulties that are in the way when one wants to know about Work on oneself, because although it is very simple that something ought to develop which I call 'Objective', or 'an Objective Faculty', or when it grows up, that is when it develops, I would call 'I', that then in regards to that what is left of me, which I will call 'It', that there is a relationship between the two. And again the relationship is twofold, One is an intellectual one of trying to come to the truth of my own existence as it is, and that that what is re-

corded in that 'I' would have to be an impartial observation of an acceptance of my existence. The reason for that is the existence of that what I am as life in this form could be recognized by my 'I' as the existence of Life, and that I could eliminate, at that time if it could be Objective, the form in which Life happens to appear.

The second is a quality I would like to assign to 'I' also, that is my 'I', that it will not forget that 'I' came into existence because of a wish of my own. We call it simply 'a creation of 'I'', as if it is a product of art, as if it exists for a definite purpose, and that I also in that kind of an entity as artistic creation, I pour part of my life, because I wish that life to be returned to me in some way or other when this 'I' is actually functioning in the way I hope. I also, in my own feeling, wish that that 'I' is a representation of Freedom. And for me Freedom asca concept, belongs of course to a different form of life. And religiously I say it is a Freedom with which I'm not familiar, but which I hope for as an aim and I believe that simply in using the term 'God' or 'eternity' or 'infinity', I reach a concept which is a little closer, even if I don't understand it than that what I now consider a finite form of existence. So that what I consider my 'I' to be and wish it to be, with which I endow it, I start out with that. I say it has to have the power of actually of observing me in truth.

The other side is I want it to have a feeling which I now call an emotional state, when it comes to the consideration of what I am as an ordinary unconscious being, and I call it 'benevolence'. These two attributes of 'I' are important because as a result of the continual feeding of 'I' in a certain way; that is, a certain wish to create and then endow it with Life, and then forgetting about my motivations but wishing at such a time that Life exists in 'I' and that 'I' functioning then in the way it ought to, I call it objective fashion, that that then records facts about myself by accepting myself as I am, without liking, without description, without putting myself in a classification or in a pigeon hole.

When this can take place, and when this 'I' could grow up, I can rely that when it is grown up, it could become useful, because if it is an Objective world, it can then by its influence and presence to me affect my condition which is now unconscious. It goes much too far to go into all kind of detail about what is actually taking place, because these things, when one tries to condense them in a few words, it is so poor, really, to try to indicate what is all involved in it.

You will only find out by trying, or making certain attempts for yourself in this kind of an application of wishing to find out if you could create that kind of an 'I'--again, in very simple forms, in a way in which you wish, then, this 'I' to become observant regarding yourself--in that observation process, collecting facts as you are, in a variety of forms of your behavior, and usually the relationship between that kind of

Objective Faculty in your brain functioning regarding the manifestations of your body, or in that what could take place in your heart, which you then call 'the intuition' giving you knowledge simply by the mere presence of being there with you in that what you are doing.

Many different ways for defining it, many different ways of expressing it, a great deal of philosophy and words can be used for all of this in order to give a little bit more insight or perspective, and of course one doesn't have the time for it. If you want to read, read ALL AND EVERYTHING and try to find out what you can find out. Try to become a little serious about that because that is really your Life, the way it should be.

When I said a little while ago I talk to each one of you, it simply means you and not someone else; but it doesn't mean that you want to hear me. All I can do is to tell you it's for you, and it's up to you to acknowledge it. If you don't, it is nothing to me. I just let it go. I think you're a fool if you don't try it. I think you're a fool if you just consider that you know already. You don't, I assure you. None of you knows, because this is an Objective Science, and we're not adjusted in ordinary life, even to understand what is meant by Objectivity, and you don't at the present time know at all, - and I talk now to those who have very seldom heard about these ideas - you don't know what is it what I'm talking about until you try, we call it 'to have an Awareness of 'I' of yourself'. It's very simple. It is a mental function which is an Aware-

ness which is different from thought. In awareness there is no thought process. It doesn't exist. In Awareness there is no liking. It doesn't exist. There is only an acknowledgement of your physical existence, and if you wish, of the different organs which of course are in your body. And if you want to try that, you will find out that, of course, you don't know anything about it. And even if you try with the best of intentions, you won't come to the right conclusion, and you will not have immediate results of that kind of Objectivity regarding yourself, because it goes over, practically immediately when you make such an attempt, into the thought about yourself or into a feeling, and then of course you're back again in an ordinary subjective world.

I say it's easy to talk about it. It's also easy to explain it in simple terms. It looks very simple. It may even encourage you to try to do something about it. But that is you. Will you do something or not? And if you try and you're not successful you may stop it already right then. Will you have any endurance? Will you have any desire to wish to continue actually to find out? Because if you don't do that, again, I say, Gurdjieff has absolutely no meaning. It doesn't matter to Gurdjieff anymore; it <u>never</u> has mattered to him. It doesn't matter even to the totality of esoteric knowledge. That doesn't stand or fall, falls with your acceptance of it. It just exists. It has nothing to do with you. If you don't want to believe it, you're free. But it is there if you wish it. Then

perhaps it can become part of you. But not the other way. Don't think that Gurdjieff or the ideas are dependent on your acceptance. Your Life is dependent on the acceptance of the ideas. It is just the other way. There is no desire on my part even to convince you. I don't care. All I wish is to tell you there is something that I call the Truth, which is convincing enough, and perhaps intriguing enough, to try to find out certain things that, I assure you, at the present time you don't know. You don't know at all. Even if you wish, even if you are careful to try to understand what is meant, and if you then have, I call it 'audacity' to try to find out what is the value, that value also eludes you. This is the kind of, you might say this is inherent in esoteric knowledge. It is not given simply as it is so that everybody can become esoteric. Otherwise it wouldn't have that name; it's not the kind of a thing that is given everywhere like air. It is some kind of a substance, you might consider that "out of this world," which at certain times comes to you, by accident.

Esoteric knowledge is like a Messenger from Above; if you believe in a higher form of being which you may call God, or our Common Father, or His Endlessness. Esoteric knowledge exists everywhere, and always has existed. It also exists on this Earth, but when you're color blind you don't see the color. When you are blind of course you cannot see it. When you have no 'I' you cannot see it. You have to make an'I' with which you can see, because at the present time in your unconscious state, you

are blind. When you can hear something, when you are blind and when you are asleep, at most what this kind of information can do is to let you have a dream. And in a dream, maybe, you want to see reality. And you may even dream about the possibilities for yourself, and the dream may be about an Objective World. In your unconscious state it remains a dream. It won't last, and when you Wake up, you will know, because of the dream, that you are asleep. That's the result of the dream. Then, knowing this, you will want to Wake up. Then you will have to Work, because Work is not a dream life, Work is an Awakened state, or a desire to create something that is Awake to yourself.

To try to be Awake, or to try to introduce Consciousness and Conscience as two concepts in your life, something quite definite has to take place because it's not an ordinary evolutionary process that slides along and gradually gets higher and higher. The process is stepwise, it is an accumulation of certain data on a certain surface, which the, let's say is the top of one step. It is an elevation which is indicated by the next step, and at the time when it goes up vertically, there is no progress in any horizontal way. The introduction of a new step means a new height. The introduction of that what could make a person Conscious is that he leaves his waking-sleeping state and has introduced something now that we call Objectivity, which does not exist in this world, but can be conceived of, and because of that can be made real by the application of certain methods. And that the difference between one step and the other

is the step between sleep and being Awake, or a step between, or a change over from, subjectivity into Objectivity. We simply say a condition of ordinary consciousness and a definition of self Consciousness, or sometimes if you like, a difference between that what has regressed as subconscious becoming real Conscious. And with that you link up with a variety of other concepts, which of course different people know about, but it is difficult to know how to go from one place to the other.

To say it again a little different, the difference between our waking-sleeping state which we call conscious and the state of self-Consciousness is that the quantum of Objectivity has to be introduced to go from one level to another. And for that now we leave it.

I hope you will read. I hope you will try to think about what is really the purpose even of talking about these kind of things. What is the purpose of Gurdjieff's life and his wish to have written a book? What is the idea, which is of course also behind any messenger coming from above visiting the Earth and creating conditions for a certain length of time, maybe successful in brotherhood, or at least, for a little while among disciples, and that after some time, whatever takes place on Earth, that such a civilization based on love for each other, or an understanding at least, disappears, and again that the Earth returns to its ordinary conditions of unconsciousness?

Again it is not a question of trying to explain that or even

to give reasons for it. That what is important is what we call our own world - what we are in our body, what we think, and what we feel - the realization that this world, inner world of oneself, is not functioning correctly. Because in an inner world there is of course an Earth - there should be planets, there should be a sun; otherwise, it's not the world that we can compare to a solar system in which we happen to live. In our own inner world there is no sun; there are very few planets; there is an Earth which is the body; the feelings are not emotions. My mind is unconscious and is not functioning as a sun giving me light and warmth, or my emotions do not supply the energy for the wish of the Earth to rotate around the sun, because as it is now my mind rotates around my body.

Don't let me philosophize more. I wish to encourage you to read and find out something. It is so little, it's like a little scrap of little bit of knowledge, less than one half of one percent of what you really should know if you want to grow up to be a Man; in the terminology of Gurdjieff, to become Harmonious, or in all kind of things which you want to find out what is all involved in this kind of philosophy, and why you actually, in my opinion, should be interested. Because each normal man ought to be interested in the development of his inner Life when he knows that his outer life will gradually disappear, and that many times is, already has reached a certain state in which there is no further development possible.

There are groups where work of this kind are discussed. If you wish, come, for yourself. Don't think we beg you. Don't think for a moment we need you. You come if you wish. When you feel there is a need then there is a possibility perhaps of telling you. If you admit, and I think you must, that you don't know, then perhaps - no, not anymore - then perhaps you will come to the conclusion that regarding Objectivity, one is like a little child which still has to grow up and that if there is really Life in you, you will have a wish to grow. When you grow, maybe, you become a Man, and maybe you will reach maturity. And maybe that maturity will be Self knowledge; Self Knowledge, everywhere and always.

Good night.

END TAPE

Transcribed: Paul Sengir

Typed: Lucy O'Neal

Proofed: Dan Bloch

Final Type: Dotty Joos and Susan Inadomi